

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 12-16 have been examined on their merits.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on the PTO/SB/08 A & B form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 8, 2004 and returning an initialed copy of the PTO/SB/08 A & B form, thereby confirming that the listed references have been considered.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 3, 7-9 and 16 to more clearly recite that the current is measured at a specified spot of the power line supplying power that is coupled to an optical module. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1, 3, 7-9 and 16 do not require any further search by the Patent Office. Entry and consideration of the amendments to claims 1, 3, 7-9 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 12-16 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Levinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,019,769).

To support a conclusion that a claimed invention lacks novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must teach all of the elements of a claim. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1986). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). A single source must disclose all of the claimed elements arranged as in the claim. *Richardson*

v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus, the cited reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and limitation of the claimed invention.

Levinson fails to teach or suggest detecting the current in a power line that is coupled to an optical module, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Levinson discloses a laser diode controller (162) that measures the current flowing through the emitter of a transistor (182). *See, e.g.*, col. 5, lines 1-14; Fig. 5 of Levinson. When the laser diode controller determines that the drive current for generating a predefined level of optical output power exceeds the original level of drive current needed, the controller will generate a warning message that device failure is imminent. *See* col. 9, lines 6-14 of Levinson. However, Levinson does not detect a current value in a power line for supplying power to an optical module, but instead only detects the drive current supplied from the laser diode driver, *i.e.*, transistor 182, to the laser diode. Contrary to Levinson, claim 1 of the present invention recites measuring the whole of the current being supplied to an optical module, not just the drive current supplied to a laser diode. Furthermore, since Levinson does not teach or suggest the measuring of a current being supplied to an optical module, Levinson likewise lacks any teaching or suggestion of obtaining a differential current value between a current value held in memory and a newly detected current value.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Levinson fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed elements as arranged in claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 9 is allowable, and further submits that 3, 5 and 7 are allowable as well, at least by virtue of their

dependency from claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5 and 7.

With respect to independent claims 8 and 16, Applicant submits that claims 8 and 16 are allowable for at least reasons analogous to those discussed for claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 8 and 16 are allowable, and respectfully requests that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 8 and 16.

With respect to independent claim 9, Applicant submits that claim 9 is allowable for at least reasons analogous to those discussed for claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 9 is allowable, and further submits that claims 12, 13 and 15 are allowable as well, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 9, 12, 13 and 15.

2. Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Levinson. Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 6 and 14 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed with respect to the § 102(b) rejection of claim 1, Levinson fails to teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 6.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/938,585
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q65648

Claim 14 depends from independent claim 9. As discussed with respect to the § 102(b) rejection of claim 9, Levinson fails to teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 9.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 14 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 14.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Wilson
Registration No. 45,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 28, 2005